

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Soil surface organic residue cover > 80%. Assessment level: Site is stable and without visible signs of erosion.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Drainage and erosion control measures are implemented on trails and landings to minimize detrimental effects of concentrated flow, erosion and sedimentation. Stream crossings are restored and stabilized.

Yes ☐ No ☐

The forest floor is covered with leaves, needles, fine woody debris, rocks, and/or herbaceous vegetation that protects the soil on more than 80 percent of the area.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Classic Gully Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Classic gullies are not present. Assessment level: Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and are offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Soil erosion is controlled. There are no impacts on sensitive vegetation. There are no occurrences or enlargement of gullies.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Streams, shoreline or channels are not adjacent to site.
Assessment level: For shorelines and water conveyance channels;
banks are stable or commensurate with normal geomorphological
processes, AND if bank erosion is present, it is beyond the client's
control or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes,
AND for streambanks, SVAP2 bank condition element score > 5.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Excluding all fundamentally unstable, natural geomorphic
streambanks/shorelines, all streambanks/shorelines on the operation
show few signs of erosion or bank failure. Each is stable and protected
with natural materials.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest**Soil Quality Degradation****Compaction****Planning Criteria**

Screening level: Soil compaction is not a problem AND activities do not cause soil compaction problems. Assessment level: Compaction is managed to meet client's production and management objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Soil compaction is limited to roads and landings. Tree root growth is not impeded. No more than 15 percent of the forested area is devoted to roads, trails, and landings.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Water Quality Degradation

Pesticides in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize surface water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pesticides in Ground Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize ground water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Pesticides are applied using a site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies. Environmental risk screening tool are used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool). Application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Nutrients in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND the PLU is not grazed AND there are no confined livestock areas.
Assessment level: Nutrients if applied, are based on a soil test, tissue tests or nutrient budget AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize surface water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Excess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, Bio-solids or Compost Applications in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land. Assessment level: Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest**Excessive Sediment in Surface Water****Planning Criteria**

Screening level: There are no untreated sources of erosion AND streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site. Assessment level: Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies AND heavy use areas are stable AND the SVAP2 - bank condition is ≥ 5 .

Planning Criteria MetYes ☐ No ☐**Evaluation Tests**

Drainage and erosion control measures are implemented on trails and landings to minimize detrimental effects of concentrated flow, erosion and sedimentation. Stream crossings are restored and stabilized.

Evaluation Test MetYes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Degraded Plant Condition

Inadequate Structure and Composition

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant communities support the intended land use and desired ecological functions. Assessment level: Plant communities contain adequate diversity, composition and structure to support desired ecological functions.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

The operation has a sugarbush. Seventy percent or more of the sugarbush canopy trees are sugar maples. Canopy trees are those tall enough that their tops are in direct sunlight.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

The forest or woodlot is fully stocked with tree species adapted to the site, has spacing for good tree growth and air flow between and beneath, does not have excessive tree mortality, has an understory made up of desirable species and is not inhibited by brush or other undesirable vegetation

Yes ☐ No ☐

Excessive Plant Pest Pressure

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant productivity is not limited from pest pressure. Assessment level: Pest damage to plants are below economic or environmental thresholds or client-identified criteria AND plant pests, including noxious and invasive species are managed to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Invasive and noxious weeds are controlled or not present.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Trees are selected or planted that are tolerant of known damaging pests.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Food

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR food is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Plant growth and cover is managed to develop and maintain habitat to help threatened, endangered, or declining wildlife species.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR cover is of available quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Large, old, and/or "wolf" trees are intentionally retained in the forest to provide wildlife shelter. For example, trees with gnarled appearance, loose bark, or cavities.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Dead and/or down trees are intentionally left in the forest to provide wildlife cover.

Yes ☐ No ☐

The plant cover provides cover and shelter for the chosen wildlife species.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of targeted species.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Connectivity between food resources and cover and shelter is provided for the chosen wildlife species. <see State Wildlife Action Plan>

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐